

THE  
SOLECISMS OF THE APOCALYPSE

BY  
T. COWDEN LAUGHLIN

A DISSERTATION  
PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY  
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
1902

PRINCETON, N. J.  
C. S. ROBINSON & CO., UNIVERSITY PRINTERS

62825  
L37

*Library of the Theological Seminary*

PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Pres. Patton.

*Division*

*Section*

THE  
SOLECISMS OF THE APOCALYPSE

BY  
T. COWDEN LAUGHLIN

A DISSERTATION  
PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY  
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
1902

PRINCETON, N. J.  
C. S. ROBINSON & CO., UNIVERSITY PRINTERS



# THE SOLECISMS OF THE APOCALYPSE

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

The leading works consulted in the preparation of this dissertation are the following :

- BLOSS, "Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch." Göttingen, 1896.  
 BOUSSET, "Die Offenbarung Johannis." 5 Aufl. Göttingen, 1896.  
 BURTON, "Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek." Chicago, 1893.  
 CHEYNE & BLACK, "Encyclopaedia Biblica." New York, 1899-1903.  
 EBRARD, "Das Evangelium Johannis." Zürich, 1845.  
 EBRARD, "Wissenschaftliche Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte." Dritte Aufl. Frankfurt a. M., 1868.  
 EUSEBIUS, "Ecclesiasticae Historiae"—MIGNE, "*Patrologia Graeca*."  
 EWALD, "Commentarius in Apocalypsin Johannis Exegeticus et Criticus." Lipsiae, 1828.  
 EWALD, "Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des A. T." Zweite Aufl. Leipzig, 1835.  
 EWALD, "Die Johanneischen Schriften übersetzt und erklärt." Göttingen, 1861-1862.  
 GREEN, "A Grammar of the Hebrew Language." New York, 1889.  
 GUILLEMARD, "Hebraisms in the Greek Testament." Cambridge, 1879.  
 HARNACK, Article on Word "Revelation" in "Encycl. Brit.," Vol. XX.  
 HASTINGS, "Dictionary of the Bible." New York, 1898-1902.  
 HATCH, "Essays in Biblical Greek." Oxford, 1889.  
 LIGHTFOOT, "St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians." London and New York, 1900.  
 LÜCKE, "Versuch einer Vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johannis und in die gesammte apokalyptische Litteratur." Bonn, 1852.  
 MILLIGAN, "Discussions on the Apocalypse." London, 1893.  
 MOULTON & GEDEN, "A Concordance to the Greek Testament." 2d Edition, New York, 1900.  
 SALMON, "A Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament." 9th Edition, London, 1899.  
 SPITTA, "Die Offenbarung des Johannes." Halle, 1889.  
 SWETE, "An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek." Cambridge, 1900.  
 SWETE, "The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint." 3 vols. Cambridge, 1887-1894.  
 THAYER, "Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament." New York, 1887.  
 TISCHENDORF, "Novum Testamentum Graece." Lipsiae, 1872.  
 TOY, "Quotations in the New Testament." New York, 1884.  
 VITEAU, "Étude sur le Grec du Nouveau Testament." Paris, 1893-6.  
 WESTCOTT, "The Gospel According to St. John." London, 1894.  
 WESTCOTT & HORT, "The New Testament in the Original Greek." London and Cambridge, 1885. (The references in this dissertation are to this text.)  
 WINER, "A Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament." Thayer's Edition, Andover, 1874.

## THE SOLECISMS OF THE APOCALYPSE.

---

The Greek of the Apocalypse is marked by a series of most striking peculiarities which, as has long been recognized, are due in large part to the influence of the Hebrew idiom. They appear in passages imitating the style of the Hebrew Prophets<sup>1</sup> (with whose writings the Apocalyptist was so familiar<sup>2</sup>) or in sentences or phrases transferred directly from the Hebrew of the Old Testament or from its Greek translation—the LXX.<sup>3</sup> The following pages present the evidence of this Hebrew influence in sufficient volume and with sufficient discussion of detail to make, it is hoped, a complete demonstration.<sup>4</sup> The solecisms will be considered under three heads.

<sup>1</sup> Ebrard, in speaking of the more glaring solecisms of the Apocalypse, says, that "dieselben nicht unwillkürlich, sondern in halbabsichtlicher Nachahmung des Colorits der a. t. Sprache entstanden sind. Der Autor der Apokalypse wollte offenbar hebraisirend schreiben; die Sprache und der Stil der a. t. Propheten war es, die ihm allein in ihrer grosartigen Schlichtheit genügte, das Ungeheure wiederzugeben, was er geschaut hat." ("Wissenschaftliche Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte." Dritte Aufl. Frankfurt a. M. 1868, S. 1106.)

<sup>2</sup> Ewald, "Die Johannei-chen Schriften." Bd. II, S. 52.

<sup>3</sup> The LXX translation is more Hebraic than the N. T. and does not represent a type of Greek established and in actual currency at the time it was made, but "its distinctive character is due rather to the translators' exaggerated deference to the Hebrew sacred text and their mechanical reproduction of it." (Thayer on "Language of the New Testament" in Hasting's "Dictionary of the Bible," Vol. III, p. 40.) It is not surprising, then, that solecisms are found in the LXX nor in the writings of those who quoted or made use of that translation.

<sup>4</sup> There are no less than 460 O. T. passages made use of in the Apocalypse. Westcott and Hort give a list of these in their "N. T. Greek," pp. 612 ff. and under the heading "Quotations from the O. T.," but the Apocalypse contains no quotations proper, although a great part of its language is taken from the O. T. (Toy, "Quotations in the N. T.," p. 253. Cp. Swete, "An Introduction to the O. T. in Greek," pp. 392 and 404.)

I.

PECULIAR WORDS.<sup>1</sup>

1. *ἰδοῦ*.<sup>2</sup> It is often followed by a Nominative without verb.

The LXX of the Old Testament prophecies invariably uses *ἰδοῦ* (1) as a translation of the Hebrew word הנה (behold, lo). Thus, for example, in such passages as Gen. 12:19 הנה אשתך, the LXX. of which is καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ ἡ γυνή σου (ἐναντίον σου). Gen. 16:6 אברם אל-שרי הנה שפחתך, the LXX of which is εἶπεν δὲ Ἀβραμ πρὸς Σάραν Ἰδοὺ ἡ παιδίσκη σου (ἐναντίον σου). Gen. 18:9 הנה באהל LXX ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν Ἰδοὺ ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ. Gen. 19:2 ויאמר הנה נא-אדני LXX is καὶ εἶπεν Ἰδοὺ, κύριοι, ἐκκλίνατε πρὸς τὸν οἶκον, &c. Ps. 134:1 הנה ברכו את־יהוה LXX Ἰδοὺ δὴ εὐλογεῖτε τὸν κύριον. (2) Ἰδοὺ is the LXX translation also of the Hebrew word ארו (behold), which is from the Chaldaic, in such passages as Dan. 7:5, 6, 7 and 13. It is the translation (3) of the Hebrew אלו (behold), which is also from the Chaldaic, in Dan. 2:31, for example. The LXX translation of each of these three words (הנה, ארו, and אלו) is always *ἰδοῦ*.

(a) Many passages in the Apocalypse contain *ἰδοῦ* direct from the LXX as, for example: Rev. 1:7 ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν. This follows Dan. (LXX) 7:13 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν, which follows the Aramaic original (Toy) and the Heb. וארו עס-ענני שמיא. Rev. 14:14 καὶ εἶδον, καὶ ἰδοὺ (νεφέλη λευκή) καὶ ἐπὶ τῇν νεφέλην καθήμενον ὅμοιον υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου. This follows the LXX of Dan. 7:13 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, the Hebrew of which is

ארו עס-ענני שמיא כבר אנש

<sup>1</sup> These can scarcely be called solecisms in strictest sense, yet they are peculiar especially to the Apocalypse, whose author quotes them from the LXX.

<sup>2</sup> Ebrard, in refuting Hitzig, who regards the Gospel of Mark and the Apocalypse as written by the same author, speaks of *ἰδοῦ* in the Apocalypse as "Nachahmung des Prophetenstiles . . . . wer möchte da das oftmalige *ἰδοῦ* c. ptc. für ein unwillkührliches, zufälliges halten"? ("Evangelium Johannis," S. 166.)

and the LXX of Dan. 10:16 καὶ ἰδοὺ ὡς ὁμοίωσις χειρὸς ἀνθρώπου, the Hebrew of which is יִהְיֶה כְּדַמוֹת בְּנֵי אָדָם (Cp. also Rev. 21:3 ἰδοὺ ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ θεοῦ which follows Ezek. 37:57). Rev. 12:3 καὶ ἰδοὺ δράκων . . . . ἔχων κεφαλὰς ἑπτὰ καὶ κέρατα δέκα, which follows direct the Hebrew יָחַד of Dan. 7:7 and ἰδοὺ of the LXX of Dan. 7:8.

(b) Many other passages in the Apocalypse are imitations of the LXX usage. Rev. 6:2, 5 and 8 καὶ εἶδον, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἵππος λευκός; . . . . ἵππος πυρρός . . . . καὶ ἰδοὺ ἵππος μέλας . . . . καὶ ἰδοὺ ἵππος χλωρός, which are from the LXX of Zech. 1:8 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ἵππον πυρρόν &c., to which passages the Apocalyptist here refers.<sup>1</sup>

2. Παντοκράτωρ.<sup>2</sup> The influence of the LXX explains the use of this word. It is found in the following Apocalyptic passages. Rev. 1:8 κύριος ὁ θεός, (ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ἐρχόμενος), ὁ παντοκράτωρ. Rev. 4:8 ἅγιος ἅγιος ἅγιος κύριος, ὁ θεός ὁ παντοκράτωρ (ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος). Rev. 11:17 κύριε, ὁ θεός, ὁ παντοκράτωρ (ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν). Rev. 15:3 (Μεγάλα καὶ θαυμαστὰ τὰ ἔργα σου), κύριε, ὁ θεός, ὁ παντοκράτωρ. Rev. 16:7 (ναί) κύριε, ὁ θεός, ὁ παντοκράτωρ. Rev. 16:14 (ἡμέρας τῆς μεγάλης) τοῦ θεοῦ παντοκράτωρ. Rev. 19:6 Ἀλληλουιά, ὅτι ἐβασίλευσεν κύριος, ὁ θεός, ὁ παντοκράτωρ. Rev. 19:15 τῆς ὀργῆς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ παντοκράτορος. Rev. 21:22 (καὶ ναὶ οὐκ εἶδον ἐν αὐτῇ) ὁ γὰρ κύριος, ὁ θεός, ὁ παντοκράτωρ ναὶ αὐτῆς ἐστίν. Cp., also, 2 Cor. 6:18.

In every one of the passages just specified, the expression ὁ κύριος, ὁ θεός, ὁ παντοκράτωρ is direct from the LXX of

<sup>1</sup> In other books of the New Testament, and especially in the Gospels, ἰδοὺ is found in quotations from the LXX. of the Old Testament as, Matt. 1:23 ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει καὶ τέξεται υἱόν, καὶ καλέσουσιν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανὴλ. This is the LXX from Isaiah 7:14 (Cp. Matt. 12:18; 21:5; Matt. 11:10 ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἀγγελόν μου, &c., which is the LXX for Mal. 3:1. Cp. Mk. 1:2; Lk. 7:27; Jno. 12:15; Rom. 9:33; Heb. 2:13; Heb. 8:8; Heb. 10:7, 9; 1 Pet. 2:6.)

<sup>2</sup> Παντοκράτωρ is not found in John's Gospel and only once elsewhere in the New Testament, i. e., 2 Cor. 6:18, where it occurs in a quotation from the LXX.



Amos 4: 13 κύριος ὁ θεός, ὁ παντοκράτωρ (ὄνομα αὐτῷ), which, in turn, is the translation of the Hebrew of the same passage, *i. e.*, Amos 4: 13 יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי-צְבָאוֹת (שְׁמוֹ).

3. In the Apocalypse, we always find the word "Jerusalem" written Ἱερουσαλήμ (indeclinable), but in the Gospel (and Acts, &c., where quoted) it invariably has the form Ἱεροσόλυμα. (Cp. Thayer's Winer, p. 68.) But this difference is easily accounted for when we note that the writing of the word in the Apocalypse is the same as that of the LXX (from the Hebrew יְרוּשָׁלַם) from which the Apocalypticist so often quotes. The Apocalyptic passages in which the word appears and the LXX. passages from which they are quoted follow: Rev. 21: 2 καὶ τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἁγίαν Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ νῦν εἶδον. This is quoted from Isa. 52: 1 καὶ σὺ ἐνδυσαί τὴν δόξαν σου, Ἱερουσαλήμ, πόλις ἡ ἁγία. Rev. 21: 10 καὶ ἔδειξέν μοι τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἁγίαν Ἱερουσαλήμ, &c., which follows the LXX of Isa. 52: 1 καὶ σὺ ἐνδυσαί τὴν δόξαν σου, Ἱερουσαλήμ, πόλις ἡ ἁγία. Rev. 3: 12 καὶ γράψω . . . . τὸ ὄνομα τῆς πόλεως τοῦ θεοῦ μου, τῆς καὶ νῦν Ἱερουσαλήμ.<sup>1</sup> Cp. Ezek. 48: 35.<sup>2</sup> Thus we have:—Jno. 1: 19 οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐξ Ἱεροσολύμων. Jno. 2: 13 καὶ ἀνέβη εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ὁ Ἰησοῦς. Jno. 2: 23 Ὡς δὲ ἦν ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις. Jno. 4: 20 καὶ ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐστὶν ὁ τόπος. All the other instances in John's Gospel show the declinable Ἱεροσόλυμα. If John wrote the Apocalypse, direct and conscious use of the LXX form is the only possible explanation of the variation of this word.

4. Ἀλληλουιά. In Rev. 19: 1. 3, 4 and 6 we have the word Ἀλληλουιά. This word is taken from the LXX of Pss. 106: 1; 146: 1; 147: 1; 148: 1; 149: 1; 150: 1 and 6. Ἀλληλουιά is the Greek translation of the Hebrew הלל-יה.

<sup>1</sup> For examples of Ἱερουσαλήμ in the LXX, cp. Zech. 3: 2; 9: 9; Josh. 10: 1; Ezek. 1: 2; 2: 8; 2 Chron. 12: 2, 9, 13; 19: 1, 4, 8; 20: 18, 27, 28, 31; 21: 5; 13: 20; 22: 1, 2; 23: 2 et al.

<sup>2</sup> In view of the possible common authorship of the Apocalypse and John's Gospel, it may be noted that in the Gospel the word is always written in its declinable form Ἱεροσόλυμα.

5. In Rev. 12:5 we have *καὶ ἔτικεν υἱόν, ἄρσεν, ὃς μέλλει ποιμαίνειν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*. Cp. Isa. 66:7. Here *υἱόν* is masculine and *ἄρσεν* is neuter. The word for "male" is either *ὁ ἄρσην* (masc.) or *τὸ ἄρσεν* (neut.) (Cp. Thayer's Greek Lex.) In this verse, the writer uses the neuter form while in vs. 13 of the same chapter he employed the masc. (*i. e.*, *ἐδίωξεν τὴν γυναῖκα ἣτις ἔτικεν τὸν ἄρσενά*). Since he did not use the neuter form in both sentences, we should rather expect the masculine in the first instance in connection with the masc. *υἱόν*, of which it is an appositive (although an appositive *need* only agree in case). But as Ewald suggests, "*υἱόν, ἄρσεν*," (*i. e.*, the masc. and the neut. together) is "bloss Nachahmung von *בן וזר* ein Sohn ein männliches." ("Die Joh. Schriften." Bd. II. S. 53).\*

## II.

### PECULIAR PHRASES.

1. In Rev. 15:5, (Cp. Acts 7:44), occurs the phrase "*τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου*," or more fully, "*ὁ ναὸς τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ*." This is a very striking statement, but it is simply the Greek translation of *אֶה-ל־מוֹעֵד* in such passages as Ex. 40:34, the Hebrew of which is *וַיִּכַּס הָעֵנָן אֶת־אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד*; the LXX for this is, *καὶ ἐκάλυψεν ἡ νεφέλη τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ μαρτυρίου* and Rev. 15:5 quotes it. Cp., also, Lev. 24:3 (LXX) *ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ τοῦ μαρτυρίου*; Num. (LXX) 17:7 and 8 *ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ τοῦ μαρτυρίου*; Ex. (LXX) 27:21 *ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ τοῦ μαρτυρίου*; Ex. 40:22; 40:24 and Num. 17:49.

It is also the LXX translation of *משכן־העדות* in such passages as Num. 1:50 (LXX) *ἐπὶ τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ μαρτυρίου*. Num. 1:53 (LXX) *κύκλω τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου*. Num. 10:11 (LXX) *ἡ νεφέλη ἀπὸ τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ*

\* [NOTE.—Another interesting word is *χαλκολίβανον* (Rev. 1:15 and 2:18). It is a compound word coined by the author, who here follows the Hebrew of Dan. 10:6. (Cp. Toy, "Quotations in the N. T., p. 254.) Notice, also, the compound words *ποταμοφόρητος* (Rev. 12:15) and *μεσουρανῆμα* (Rev. 8:13; 14:6; 19:17)].

μαρτυρίου. Ex. 38:21 (LXX) ἡ σύνταξις τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου.

It is further the LXX translation of מִן הַמִּזְבֵּחַ in Num. 18:2 (LXX) ἀπέναντι τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου. 2 Chron. 24:6 (LXX) εἰς τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ μαρτυρίου.

2. *Strings of Genitives.* Strings of genitives hanging on one noun or on one another are frequent in the Apocalypse. Rev. 19:15 τὴν ληνὸν τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ θυμοῦ τῆς ὀργῆς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ παντοκράτερος. Rev. 14:10 καὶ αὐτὸς πιέεται ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ θυμοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ . . . ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ τῆς ὀργῆς αὐτοῦ. Rev. 16:19 τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ θυμοῦ τῆς ὀργῆς αὐτοῦ. Rev. 14:8 ἡ ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ θυμοῦ τῆς πορνείας. Rev. 18:3 ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ θυμοῦ τῆς πορνείας αὐτῆς, &c. (Cp., also, Rev. 22:19 ἀπὸ τῶν λόγων τοῦ βιβλίου τῆς προφητείας ταύτης. Cp. Rev. 21:6.)

The passages above are not only imitations of the LXX, but are all more or less directly quoted from the LXX of Jer. 25:15 which is, τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ ἀκράτος τούτου. Cp. Isa. 51:17.

3. *Repetition of Prepositions* before a series of nouns, as in Rev. 16:13 καὶ εἶδον ἐκ τοῦ στόματος τοῦ δράκοντος καὶ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος τοῦ θηρίου καὶ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος τοῦ ψευδοπροφήτου. Rev. 21:13 ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς πυλῶνες τρεῖς, καὶ ἀπὸ βορρᾶ πυλῶνες τρεῖς, καὶ ἀπὸ νότου πυλῶνες τρεῖς, καὶ ἀπὸ δυσμῶν πυλῶνες τρεῖς. Rev. 17:6 καὶ εἶδον τὴν γυναῖκα μεθύουσαν ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος τῶν μαρτύρων Ἰησοῦ. (Cp. Rev. 9:21.) Rev. 7:1 ἵνα μὴ πνέῃ ἄνεμος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς μήτε ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης μήτε ἐπὶ πᾶν δέδρον. Rev. 3:5 καὶ ὁμολογήσω τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐνώπιον τοῦ πατρὸς μου καὶ ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ. Rev. 7:9 ἐστῶτης ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου καὶ ἐνώπιον τοῦ ἀρνίου. (Cp. 4:5 and 4:10, &c.) Here is displayed not only a repetition of prepositions, but, in the last two examples, an unusual preposition.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The preposition ἐνώπιον is very common in the LXX and is the Greek translation of the Hebrew words עֲנִי and עֲנִי. Thus, for example, the word ἐνώπιον in Rev. 3:9 occurs in the LXX of Isa. 66:23 i. e., ἔξει πᾶσα σὰρξ τοῦ προσκυνῆσαι ἐνώπιον ἐμοῦ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ, from which it is quoted, ἐνώπιον being the LXX of עֲנִי from the phrase יהוה יברך כל־בשר להשתחוית לפני אבר יהוה of Isa. 66:23. Cp. Isa. 49:23; 60:14.) (Cp. ἐνώπιον in Rev. 15:4, which is quoted from Ps. 86:9). Wherever this word occurs in the Apocalypse (and it occurs thirty-one times) it is the LXX translation direct, or in imitation of the Hebrew word עֲנִי.



“völlig eigenthümlich und anomalisch. Hier ist *καιρὸς* so viel als zwei Zeiträume, Jahre, aber dies ist der technische apokalyptische Sprachgebrauch aus Daniel 7:25; 12:7 genommen, wo die LXX עֲרֵינִי durch *καιρὸς* übersetzt.”

### III.

#### PECULIAR CONSTRUCTIONS.

1. In Rev. 2:14 occurs the expression *ὃς ἐδίδασκεν τῷ βαλάκ* in which the word “teach” is followed by a Dative of person in imitation of the Hebrew לָמַר. (Cp. Thayer’s Lexicon on the word *διδάσκω*; also Job 21:22, *i. e.*, הָלֵאֵל יִלְמַר רַעַת and Ewald, “gr. Hebr.,” p. 588.)

2. The Preposition *ἀπὸ* with the Nominative. Rev. 1:4 *ἀπὸ ὧν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος*. This solecism is striking in the highest degree.<sup>1</sup> Some authors have tried to soften the expression by inserting the article *τοῦ* after *ἀπὸ*. But this would not explain the anomaly here, “quod scriptor omnino praepositiones cum nominativo jungere soleat.”<sup>2</sup> The phrase *ὁ ὧν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ἐρχόμενος*<sup>3</sup> is the Greek equivalent for the Hebrew name

<sup>1</sup> Guillemard speaks of this as “an anomalous construction clearly traceable to absence of inflexion in Hebrew nouns which made such a violation of grammar less startling to a Jew writing Greek.” (“Hebraisms in the Greek Testament, p. 116.)

<sup>2</sup> Ewald, “Com. in Apoc.,” p. 46.

<sup>3</sup> Ebrard regards this phrase as intentional on the part of the writer, saying of it, “die absichtliche Behandlung der ganzen Formel *ὁ ὧν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ἐρχόμενος* als unveränderlichen nom. propr. wo das erste *ὁ* sowie das zweite und dritte als integrierender Theil des Namens betrachtet wird, liegt hier gar zu klar am Tage” (“Evangelium Johannis,” S. 165–166) and Harnack, in speaking of the same phrase, says, “the gross violations of Greek grammar are not to be explained from ignorance.”\* (“Encycl. Brit.” on word “Revelation.”)

\* The proper construction of *ἀπὸ* with the Genitive occurs in the same verse (*i. e.*, 1:4), *ἀπὸ τῶν ἑπτα πνευμάτων*, proving that the author did not use *ἀπὸ* with the Nominative through ignorance.

Jehovah. Lücke regards it "als ein Begriff anzusehen, wodurch nach Rabbinischer Deutung des Namens Jehova der ewige Gott bezeichnet wird."<sup>1</sup> 'Ο ὦν is directly quoted from the LXX of Ex. 3:14 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς πρὸς Μωσῆν λέγων Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ὦν. Καὶ εἶπεν Οὕτως ἐρεῖς τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ ὁ ὦν ἀπέσταλκέν με πρὸς ὑμᾶς, the phrase ὁ ὦν being the translation of אֲנִי הוּא אֲנִי.<sup>2</sup> Thus the Apocalyptist used the expression ὁ ὦν directly from the LXX<sup>3</sup> and does not change the form to the Genitive after ἀπό. Naturally the other words or parts of the phrase, namely, ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, are in the same construction as ὁ ὦν "da es kein Particip des Praeteritums von εἶναι giebt, so ist schwer einzusehen, wie der Verfasser das ὁ ἦν (der war) anders hätte ausdrücken sollen."<sup>4</sup>

3. *The Genitive and Accusative joined by καὶ, instead of two Genitives, after a Word of Fullness.* The use of the accusative after the idea of fullness is a Hebrew idiom. Thus, Rev. 17:4b ἔχουσα ποτήριον χρυσοῦν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτῆς γέμον βδελυγμάτων καὶ τὰ ἀκάθαρτα τῆς πορνείας αὐτῆς. (Cp. Jer. 51:7). τὰ ἀκάθαρτα instead of τῶν ἀκαθάρτων, imitates the Hebrew. A capital illustration of this usage is found in 2 Sam. 23:7

אִישׁ יָנַע בָּהֶם יִמְלֵא בְרוּל וְעַצ הַנִּית

Even the LXX translation of this passage has followed the Hebrew entirely, namely, καὶ πληρὲς σιδήρου καὶ ξύλον δόρατος. Again, the LXX of Ezek. 39:20 has the accusative after the word "filled," thus: καὶ ἐμπλησθήσεσθε (ἐπὶ τῆς παραπέζης μου) ἵππον καὶ ἀναβάτην καὶ γέγοντα. The same thing is found in Ex. 1:7 וַתִּמְלֵא הָאָרֶץ אָתָּם, the LXX of which has πληθύνεν δὲ ἡ γῆ αὐτούς. The accusative is the usual construction after a word of fullness in Hebrew. "Wörter wie מלא gewöhnlich mit dem Accusative . . . sich verbinden." (Ewald, "Die Joh. Schriften," S. 53.) In further proof of this, cp.

<sup>1</sup> "Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Johannes," S. 462.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Isa. 41:4 אֲנִי יְהוָה רֹאשׁוֹן וְאַתָּה אַחֲרָיִם אֲנִי-הוּא.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. Thayer's Winer, p. 68.

<sup>4</sup> Lücke, "Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Johannes," 2 Aufl., S. 462.

Gesenius' "Hebrew and Eng. Lex." on the word מלח, p. 473. Also Lücke, "Einleitung u. s. w." S. 461. Rev. 17:4b, then, (the passage in question) is a mixture of Greek and Hebrew constructions, the Genitive βδελυγμάτων after γέμον being a Greek construction while the accusative τὰ ἀκάθαρτα is Hebrew.

4. *A Double-Gender.* The word ληνός (wine-press) is given a double gender in Rev. 14:19 and 20. Thus, καὶ ἔβαλεν εἰς τὴν ληνὸν τοῦ θυμοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν μέγαν [the great wine-press] καὶ ἐπατήθη ἡ ληνὸς ἐξώθεν τῆς πόλεως; the feminine τὴν ληνὸν and then the masculine τὸν μέγαν [ληνόν]. This construction is found in Isa. 63:3, from which this verse is suggested; thus

פורה ררכתי לבדי . . . . אתי ואדרכס באפי

Here פורה is feminine and אדרכס is masculine. Thayer remarks that this is a variation in gender which can hardly be matched in Greek though not rare in Hebrew.<sup>1</sup>

5. *Disagreement in Gender.* *Feminine nouns* are frequently followed by an adjective or participle in the *masculine*. Rev. 4:1 καὶ ἡ φωνὴ ἡ πρώτη ἣν ἤκουσα . . . . λέγων; φωνὴ is followed by the masculine participle λέγων. Rev. 9:13 and 14 καὶ ἤκουσα φωνὴν μίαν ἐκ τῶν κεράτων . . . . λέγοντα τῷ ἔκτῳ ἀγγέλῳ; λέγοντα instead of λέγουσαν. Rev. 11:4 αἱ δύο ἐλαῖαι . . . . ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου τῆς γῆς ἐστῶτες; ἐστῶτες instead of ἐστῶσαι follows the feminine noun ἐλαῖαι. Rev. 11:15 καὶ ἐγένοντο φωναὶ μεγάλαι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, λέγοντες; λέγοντες following φωναί. Rev. 17:3 καὶ εἶδον γυναῖκα καθήμενὴν ἐπὶ θηρίον κόκκινον, γέμοντα ὀνόματα βλασφημίας. Rev. 17:3 καὶ εἶδον γυναῖκα καθήμενὴν . . . . γέμοντα ὀνόματα . . . . ἔχοντα κεφαλὰς ἑπτὰ καὶ κέρατα δέκα. (Cp. Dan. 7:7.) Such neglect of agreement in gender, as above described, follows the Hebrew structure. On this Green remarks: "Masculines are often used in Hebrew when *females* are spoken of or when the *nouns* to which they refer are feminine, from a neglect to note the gender where no stress is laid

<sup>1</sup> "Greek Eng. Lex. of N. T.," p. 377; Cp., also, Green's "Heb. Gram.," p. 359.

upon it." ("Heb. Gram.," p. 359.)<sup>1</sup> The Apocalyptist imitates this Hebrew construction in the passages just given. His defiance of grammar in those instances was intentional. He knew, for example, that the feminine adjective should agree with the feminine noun, as a number of texts show. This is seen in Rev. 6 : 9 and 10, where there is a feminine noun followed by a masculine participle and *also* a feminine noun followed by a feminine adjective, namely, *φωνῇ μεγάλῃ*. The same expression occurs also in Rev. 7 : 2 ; 14 : 7 and 18. Cp. 16 : 1, 3, 17 ; 18 : 2, 4, &c. The disagreement in gender is clearly due to Hebrew influence and Lücke in speaking of such constructions says, "Diese Anomalien lösen sich grösstentheils durch die Annahme einer constructio ad sensum, wie sie auch den besten Schriftstellern nicht fremd ist."<sup>2</sup>

6. *Disagreement in Case.* (1) A *Nominative* replaced by an *Accusative*. Rev. 7 : 9 *ἑστῶτες ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου καὶ ἐνώπιον τοῦ ἀρνίου, περιβεβλημένους στολὰς λευκάς*. Again Rev. 11 : 3 *καὶ προφητεύουσιν (they) ἡμέρας χιλίας . . . . περιβεβλημένους*. Rev. 10 : 8 *καὶ ἡ φωνή . . . . λαλοῦσαν μετ' ἐμοῦ καὶ λέγουσαν*.

(2) An *Accusative* replaced by a *Nominative*. Rev. 5 . 6 *καὶ εἶδον . . . . ἀρνίον . . . . ἔχων κέρατα ἑπτὰ . . . .* Rev. 14 :

<sup>1</sup> Neglect of gender is very frequent (a) in pronouns referring to *females*. Thus Ruth 1 : 8 *יְעִישָׁה יְהוָה עִמָּכֶם חֹכֶר כְּאִשֶּׁר יְעִישִׁים עִם־הַכֹּתִים וְעַמִּי*. The word *עִמָּכֶם* (inasc.) is used although the reference is to Ruth and Orpah ; also *עִשִׂים* (masc.), reference still being to Ruth and Orpah. This is illustrated again in Exodus 1 : 21. *וַיְחִי כִּי־רָאוּ הַמִּלֵּלֹת אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים וַיַּעַשׂ לָהֶם בָּתִּים* and *לָהֶם* masculine. Cp., also, Ex. 2 : 17 ; Num. 36 : 6 ; Jud. 11 : 34 ; 19 : 24 ; 1 Sam. 6 : 7 ; 2 Sam. 6 : 22 ; Jud. 21 : 12.

(b) Neglect of gender is *most* frequent in pronouns (masc.) referring to *feminine nouns*, as Ex. 11 : 6 *וּבִמְהוֹ . . . . כְּמֹהוּ . . . . אֲשֶׁר גָּדְלָה . . . . צַעֲקָה גְדֹלָה*. Here the word *צַעֲקָה* is *feminine* and *כְּמֹהוּ* (referring to *צַעֲקָה*) is *masculine*. Levit. 27 : 9 *וְאֵם־בְּהֵמָה כָּל־אֲשֶׁר יֵתֵן מִמֶּנּוּ לִיהוֹה הִי־קֹדֶשׁ*. Here the word *בְּהֵמָה* is *feminine* and *מִמֶּנּוּ* is *masculine*.\*

<sup>2</sup> "Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Johannes," S. 463.

\* Cp. for similar disagreement in gender, the Hebrew of Ex. 22 : 25 ; Lev. 6 : 8 ; 27 : 9 ; Num. 3 : 27, 33 ; Deut. 27 : 5 ; 1 Sam. 10 : 18 ; Isa. 34 : 17, &c., and for further lack of agreement in adjectives and participles, cp. 1 Kings 22 : 13 ; Ps. 119 : 137 and 2 Chron. 3 : 11. Cp. Green's "Heb. Gram.," pp. 357-359.



6 and 7a καὶ εἶδον ἄλλον ἄγγελον . . . . λέγων . . . . Rev. 19:14 καὶ τὰ στρατεύματα . . . . ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ . . . . ἐνδεδυμένοι βύσσινον λευκὸν καθαρὸν. Cp., also, Rev. 13:1; 14:14; 17:3 and 20:4. This neglect of agreement in case is common enough in Hebrew. Especially *when clauses intervened*, accurate constructions were thus neglected.<sup>1</sup>

7. *Anomalous Use of Apposition.* The well-known rule that an appositive agrees with its noun in case, is broken many times by the language of the Apocalypse.

(1) *Nominative in Apposition with Genitive.* Rev. 1:5 καὶ ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός. The phrase ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός is directly quoted from the LXX of Ps. 89:37. (Cp. Prov. 14:5). Ebrard says of this, "das scheint mir beabsichtigt, scheint mir Manier zu sein," and Lücke (speaking of this and similar anomalies) says, "sie scheinen ihren Grund . . . . in dem rhetorischen charakter der Apokalypse zu haben."<sup>3</sup>

This occurs again in Rev. 3:12 τὸ ὄνομα τῆς πόλεως τοῦ θεοῦ μου, τῆς καινῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἡ καταβαίνουσα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ; ἡ καταβαίνουσα, instead of a Genitive, in apposition with τῆς καινῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ. Another instance of this is found in Rev. 14:12 ὧδε ἡ ὑπομονὴ τῶν ἁγίων ἐστίν, οἱ τηροῦντες τὰς ἐντολάς, &c., οἱ τηροῦντες where we should expect τῶν τηρούντων in apposition with τῶν ἁγίων.

(2) *Nominative in Apposition with Dative.* Rev. 9:14 λέγοντα τῷ ἔκτῳ ἁγγέλῳ, ὁ ἔχων τὴν σάλπιγγα.

(3) *Nominative in Apposition with Accusative.* Rev. 2:20 ἀλλὰ ἔχω κατὰ σου ὅτι ἀφείς τὴν γυναῖκα Ἰέζαβελ, ἡ λέγουσα ἐάντην προφητίαν. Rev. 20:2 καὶ ἐκράτησεν τὸν δράκοντα, ὁ ὄφεις ὁ ἄρχαῖος.

(4) *Nominative in Apposition with Vocative.* Rev. 16:7 Ναί, κύριε, ὁ θεός, ὁ παντοκράτωρ. (Cp. Rev. 16:5). Rev. 11:7. Εὐ-

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Green's "Hebrew Gram.." p. 357. Cp., also, Ewald, "Die Joh. Schriften," Bd. II., S. 53.

<sup>2</sup> "Evangelium Johannis," S. 165.

<sup>3</sup> "Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Johannes," Bd. II., 2 Aufl., S. 459. Cp. Toy's "Quotation in the N. T.," p. 253.

χαριστοῦμέν σοι, κύριε, ὁ θεός, ὁ παντοκράτωρ. Rev. 15:3 κύριε, ὁ θεός, ὁ παντοκράτωρ, as in the LXX of Zech, 3:8 ἄκουε δὴ, Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἱερός ὁ μέγας, σὺ καὶ, &c. In the above examples, we find the Nominative in apposition with every single oblique case. In each of these examples (except Nominative in apposition with Vocative), the connection between the preceding substantive and the adjective clause describing it, is a loose one. This is especially true of the first two examples under (1) and the second, under (3). Of these constructions Ewald writes, "Cujus dictionis causa licet in hebraismo casus non distinguente quaerenda sit."<sup>1</sup> In regard to the examples under (4), we may say that the name Jehovah appears in the Nominative as in apposition to the Vocative κύριε perhaps because it is a direct translation of a Hebrew proper name, the author having in mind the appositive construction of the Hebrew, where a more extended use is made of it than in occidental languages;<sup>2</sup> or, again, this construction may have been used because the Greek article has no form for the Vocative case. This is Ewald's view who says "denn da die Hebräer keine Interjection für den Vokativ haben, so steht das Nomen in Anrede ganz ungeändert;"<sup>3</sup> or, further, the writer in these two instances may have had in mind the Aramaic construction which has no case endings.<sup>4</sup>

8. *The Absolute Use of the Participle λέγων.* Rev. 11:1 καὶ ἐδόθη μοι κάλαμος . . . . λέγων, ἔγειρε καὶ μέτρησον κ. τ. λ. Rev. 19:6 καὶ ἤκουσα ὡς φωνὴν . . . . καὶ ὡς φωνὴν βροντῶν ἰσχυρῶν λέγοντες κ. τ. λ. This is LXX usage, corresponding to רָאָה<sup>5</sup> as the following examples show: Gen. 15:1 μετὰ δὲ τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα ἐγενήθη ῥῆμα κυρίου πρὸς Ἀβραὰμ ἐν ὁράματι λέγων, &c. Gen. 22:20 καὶ ἀνηγγέλη τῷ Ἀβραὰμ λέγοντες κ. τ. λ. Gen. 38:13 καὶ ἀπηγγέλη θάμαρ . . . . λέγοντες κ. τ. λ. Gen. 40:16

<sup>1</sup> "Commentarius in Apocalypsin," p. 44.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Green, "Heb. Gram.," p. 281.

<sup>3</sup> "Gram. d. heb. Sprache," S. 568. Cp. Zech. 3:8.

<sup>4</sup> Cp. Salmon, "Introd. to N. T.," p. 240.

<sup>5</sup> Cp. Thayer's Winer, p. 536.

καὶ διεβοήθη ἡ φωνὴ εἰς τὸν οἶκον Φαραὼ λέγοντες κ. τ. λ. Gen. 48:2 ἀπηγγέλη δὲ τῷ Ἰακώβ λέγοντες κ. τ. λ. Josh. 10:17 καὶ ἀπηγγέλη τῷ Ἰησοῦ λέγοντες κ. τ. λ. Judges 16:2 καὶ ἀνηγγέλη τοῖς Γαζαίοις λέγοντες κ. τ. λ. 1 Sam. 15:12 καὶ ἀπηγγέλη τῷ Σαούλ λέγοντες κ. τ. λ.

9. In Hebrew, very often the emphasized word stands at the beginning of a sentence without any grammatical connection with any word in that sentence. The accustomed order is restored by a demonstrative pronoun placed later in the sentence. Examples of this are numerous, as in

Gen. 47:21 ואת־העם העביר אתו.

Jer. 25:31 הרשעים נתנם לחרב נאס־יהוה.

Gen. 2:17 ומעצ הדעת טוב ורע לא תאכל ממנו.

1 Sam. 25:29 ואת־נפש איבִיך יקלענה בתוך כך הקלע.

The *Apocalypse* reproduces this peculiarity of structure: Rev. 2:26 καὶ ὁ νικῶν καὶ ὁ τηρῶν ἄχρι τέλους τὰ ἔργα μου, δώσω αὐτῷ κ. τ. λ. Rev. 3:12 ὁ νικῶν ποιήσω αὐτὸν στύλον κ. τ. λ. Rev. 3:21 ὁ νικῶν δώσω αὐτῷ καθίσαι κ. τ. λ. Rev. 6:8 καὶ ὁ καθήμενος ἐπάνω (αὐτοῦ) ὄνομα αὐτῷ [ὁ] θάνατος.

10. Sentences Joined by καί. Rev. 11:3 καὶ δώσω τοῖς δυσὶν μάρτυσίν μου καὶ προφητεύουσιν. (Cp. Rev. 20:4; 9:4, 5.) Rev. 3:9 has the same kind of a sentence, but with ἵνα<sup>1</sup> and α καὶ following. Thus, ἰδὸν ποιήσω αὐτοὺς ἵνα ἤξουσιν καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν ἐνώπιον τῶν ποδῶν σου. This follows the Hebrew of Isaiah 44:14 which is יעברו יאליך ישתחוו אליך יתפללו<sup>2</sup>

11. καὶ (Hebrew ו) in the *Apodosis*.<sup>3</sup> It is similar to the German "so." The following examples may be given: Rev. 10:7 ἀλλ' ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ ἐβδόμου ἀγγέλου, ὅταν

<sup>1</sup> A similar example of the use of ἵνα is found in Rev. 13:12 καὶ ποιεῖ τὴν γῆν καὶ τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ κατοικοῦντας ἵνα προσκυνήσουσιν τὸ θηρίον τὸ πρῶτον. Also, Rev. 13:16 καὶ ποιεῖ πάντας, τοὺς μικροὺς καὶ τοὺς μεγάλους . . . ἵνα δώσῃ αὐτοῖς χάραγμα. (Cp. Rev. 22:14.) \*

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Isa. 49:23 and 60:14; Toy, "Quotations in the N. T.," p. 257.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. Thayer's "Greek Eng. Lex.," p. 316<sup>a</sup> f.

\* Cp. Ewald, "Die Joh. Schriften," Bd. II, S. 53.

μέλλη σαλπίζειν, καὶ ἐτελέσθη τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ. Rev. 14: 9 and 10 εἴ τις προσκυνεῖ τὸ θηρίον . . . . καὶ αὐτὸς πιέται ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου κ. τ. λ. Rev. 3:20 εἰάν τις ἀκούσῃ τῆς φωνῆς μου . . . . καὶ εἰσελεύσομαι πρὸς αὐτὸν . . . . This use of καὶ in the apodosis is exactly similar to ׀ in such Hebrew passages as Gen. 3:5, מִמֶּנּוּ וּנְפַקְחוּ עֵינֵיכֶם כִּי יֵדַע אֱלֹהִים כִּי בְיוֹם אֲכַלְכֶּם Ps. 78:34 אִם-הִרְגָם וּדְרָשׁוּהוּ Judges 4:8 וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלֵיהֶם בָּרַק אִם-תִּלְכִּי עִמִּי וְהִלַּכְתִּי

12. *The Demonstrative αὐτός Redundantly Used in Relative Sentences.* The Hebrew relative pronoun, which always stands at the beginning of its clause, has only the one simple form—אשר—which admits of no inflection to represent case. Consequently, when this relative “is governed by a verb, noun or preposition, this is shown by appending an appropriate pronominal suffix to the governing word”,<sup>1</sup> as for example, אשר שלחו or אשר זרעו. This use in Hebrew may be seen in the following examples: Isa. 41:8 אשר בחרתיך יאתה ישראל עבדי יעקב אשר Isa. 41:9 אשר החזקתיך ורע אברהם אהבי אשר נקראשמי Amos 9:12 אשר עליהם The LXX follows the Hebrew exactly here, namely, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐφ’ οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ’ αὐτούς.<sup>2</sup> This Hebraism very often occurs<sup>3</sup> in the LXX.<sup>4</sup>

Examples of this redundant use of αὐτός in relative sentences are found in the following Apocalyptic passages: Rev. 3:8 ἣν οὐδεὶς δύναται κλείσαι αὐτήν. Rev. 7:2 οἷς ἐδόθη αὐτοὺς ἀδικῆσαι τὴν γῆν κ. τ. λ. Rev. 7:9 ὃν ἀριθμῆσαι αὐτὸν οὐδεὶς

<sup>1</sup> Green, “Heb. Gram.,” p. 367; Cp. p. 106.

<sup>2</sup> This LXX passage is *directly* quoted in Acts 15:17, thus proving that the writer of Acts employed Hebraisms when quoting from the LXX.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. Thayer’s “Grk. Eng. Lex.,” p. 86 (5); Bousset, “Offenbarung Johannis,” S. 184. Cp. Ewald, “gr. hebr.,” ss. 647–648; Green, “Hebrew Gram.,” p. 368.

<sup>4</sup> Cp., for example, Ex. 3:5; Eccl. 10:17; Deut. 4:7, 8, 19, 32; Deut. 14:9; 19:17; Josh. 2:10.

ἐδύνατο. Rev. 13:8 οὐ οὐ γέγραπται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ. Rev. 13:12 οὐ ἐθεραπεύθη ἡ πληγὴ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ. Rev. 20:8 ὢν ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτῶν ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης. Cp. Rev. 17:9.

13. *Pleonastic ἐκεῖ*. Where a preceding adverb (or relative pronoun) has "already attracted the verb, ἐκεῖ is added to this verb pleonastically."<sup>1</sup> Examples of this in Hebrew may be found in Deut. 4:5 אַשֶׁר אַתֶּם בָּאִים שָׁמָּה לְרִשְׁתָּהּ, the LXX translation of which is εἰς ἣν ὑμεῖς εἰς πορεύεσθε ἐκεῖ κληρονομεῖν αὐτήν. Deut. 4:14 אַשֶׁר אַתֶּם עֹבְרִים שָׁמָּה לְרִשְׁתָּהּ, the LXX of which has εἰς ἣν ὑμεῖς εἰσπορεύεσθε ἐκεῖ κληρονομεῖν αὐτήν. Deut. 4:26 אַשֶׁר אַתֶּם בָּרִים אֶת־הִירְדֵּן שָׁמָּה לְרִשְׁתָּהּ and the LXX is εἰς ἣν ὑμεῖς διαβαίνετε τὸν Ἰορδάνην ἐκεῖ κληρονομήσαι αὐτήν.

Examples of this Hebraism in the *Apocalypse* are: Rev. 12:6 καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἔφυγεν εἰς τὴν ἔρημον, ὅπου ἔχει ἐκεῖ τόπον ἡτοιμασμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ. Rev. 12:14 εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτῆς, ὅπου τρέφεται ἐκεῖ κ. τ. λ. (Cp. Rev. 17:9.)

14. *The Present Tense Passes into the Future*. The present and future tenses are found coördinately in the same clause or sentence where, according to the usage of the language, we should expect the future of both verbs. Rev. 1:7 ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν, καὶ ὄψεται αὐτὸν πᾶς ὀφθαλμός. Ewald remarks "oratio continuata in futurum tempus abit, ut ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται καὶ ὄψεται prorsus hebraeum הִנֵּה הַלֵךְ וְרָאָה."<sup>2</sup> Rev. 2:5 εἰ δὲ μὴ, ἔρχομαι σοι, καὶ κινήσω τὴν λυχνίαν σου ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτῆς. Rev. 2:16 εἰ δὲ μὴ, ἔρχομαί σοι ταχύ, καὶ πολεμήσω μετ' αὐτῶν κ. τ. λ. Rev. 2:22 ἰδοὺ βάλλω αὐτήν εἰς κλίνην . . . . καὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς ἀποκτενῶ ἐν θανάτῳ. Cp. Rev. 3:9; 17:13–14. Examples of this breach of grammar in LXX passages are: Zech. 2:9 διότι ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐπιφέρω τὴν χεῖρά μου ἐπ' αὐτούς, καὶ

<sup>1</sup> Thayer, "Greek Eng. Lex.," p. 194; Bousset, "Offenbarung Johannis," S. 184.

<sup>2</sup> "Commentarius in Apocalypsin," p. 39.

ἔσονται σκῦλα τοῖς δουλεύουσιν αὐτοῖς. Zech. 2:10 διότι ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἔρχομαι καὶ κατασκηνώσω ἐν μέσῳ σου.

15. *Neuter Plural Subject with Plural Verb.* In the Apocalypse, neuter plural nouns are very frequently followed by plural verbs.<sup>1</sup> Rev. 4:5 ἃ εἰσιν τὰ ἐπὶ τὰ πνεύματα τοῦ θεοῦ. Rev. 4:8 καὶ τὰ τεσσαεραζῶα . . . γέμουσιν ὀφθαλμῶν. Rev. 4:9 καὶ ὅταν δώσουσιν τὰ ζῶα κ. τ. λ. Rev. 5:14 καὶ τὰ τέσσαρα ζῶα ἔλεγον Ἀμήν. Rev. 9:20 ἃ οὔτε βλέπειν δύνανται κ. τ. λ. Rev. 11:13 καὶ ἀπεκτάνθησαν . . . ὀνόματα κ. τ. λ. Rev. 18:23 ἐπλανήθησαν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. Rev. 16:20 καὶ ὄρη οὐχ εὐρέθησαν. Rev. 20:12 καὶ βιβλία ἡνοίχθησαν (quoted from Dan. 7:10 (Hebrew)). Cp. Rev. 3:2, 4; 11:2; 16:14; 17:12; 17:15; 21:4, &c. The neuter plural with plural verb is also LXX usage, as may be seen in Zech. 2:11 καὶ καταφεύξονται ἔθνη πολλὰ ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ. Zech. 10:7 καὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν ὀψονται καὶ εὐφρανθήσονται. Ezek. 39:7 καὶ γνώσονται τὰ ἔθνη ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι κύριος. Nahum 3:10 καὶ τὰ νήπια αὐτῆς ἐδαφιοῦσιν. Cp., also, LXX passages quoted by Justin Martyr in "Πρὸς Τρύφωνα Ἰουδαῖον Διάλογος." (Otto's Edition, Vol. I, pp. 408, 426, 434, 444, 480, &c.) But what is of special interest here, is the fact that this anomaly often occurs in passages quoted directly from the LXX. This is true of the following: Rev. 15:4 ὅτι πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἔξουσιν καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν ἐνώπιόν σου. καὶ τὰ δικαιώματά σου ἐφανερώθησαν—a direct quotation from the LXX of Ps. 86:9 τὰ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη (ὅσα ἐποίησας) ἤξουσιν καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν ἐνώπιόν σου. (Cp. Isa. 66:23.) Rev. 18:3 πέπτωκαν (or πέπωκαν) πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. This is LXX of Jer. 51:7 (28:7) ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴνου αὐτῆς ἐπίοσαν ἔθνη διὰ τοῦτο ἐσαλεύθησαν. Rev. 21:24 καὶ περιπατήσουσιν τὰ ἔθνη διὰ τοῦ φωτὸς αὐτῆς. This is from the LXX of Isa. 60:3 καὶ πορεύονται βασιλεῖς τῷ φωτί σου, καὶ ἔθνη τῇ λαμπρότητί σου. Rev. 11:18 καὶ τὰ ἔθνη ὠργίσθησαν. The

<sup>1</sup> The neuter plural is often found, however, with singular verbs, as in Rev. 2:27; 8:3; 13:14; 14:13; 16:14; 18:14; 19:14; 20:3, 5, 7, 12; 21:12.

LXX of Ps. 46 (45):6 is ἐταράχθησαν ἔθνη, ἐκλιναν βασιλείαι. Cp. Ps. (LXX) 2:1, *i. e.*, τί ἐφρύξααν ἔθνη. Rev. 19:21 καὶ πάντα ὄρνεα ἐχορτάθησαν ἐκ τῶν σαρκῶν αὐτῶν. This is from the LXX of Ezek. 39:17–21, *i. e.*, εἶπον παντὶ ὄρνέῳ πετεινῷ καὶ πρὸς πάντα τὰ θηρία τοῦ πεδίου ἄχθητε καὶ ἔρχεσθε . . . . φάγεσθε . . . . πίεσθε . . . . ἐμπλησθήσεσθε . . . . Such passages show conclusively the influence of the LXX upon the writer.

This completes our examination of the Solecisms of the Apocalypse,<sup>1</sup> which, as we have shown, are clearly due to the influence which the prophetic writings of the Old Testament, either in their Hebrew form or in that of their translation into Greek—the Septuagint—exerted upon the Author.

<sup>1</sup>See Corollaries on next page.

## COROLLARIES.

We present the following corollaries which grow out of the preceding discussions:

1. Since the solecisms of the Apocalypse are to be accounted for in the manner just described, they form no argument in favor of the "*Early Date*"<sup>1</sup> for the composition of the Apocalypse as maintained by Westcott,<sup>2</sup> Lightfoot<sup>3</sup> and Salmon.<sup>4</sup>

2. The Solecisms of the Apocalypse do not invalidate the testimony of Irenaeus<sup>5</sup> as to the composition<sup>6</sup> of the Apocalypse.

3. Those writers<sup>7</sup> who hold that John's Gospel and the Apocalypse were written by the same author, need not infer that an interval of *from twenty to thirty years* intervened between the two compositions.

4. Viewing the evidence as a whole, the impression is strong that the author of the Apocalypse made use of the LXX and Hebrew idiom in a conscious effort to reproduce the manner and spirit of the ancient Prophets; it was not through ignorance of correct Greek usage.

NOTE.—The difference between the language of John's Gospel and the Apocalypse, due mainly to the solecisms of the latter, has

<sup>1</sup> About the year 68 A. D.

<sup>2</sup> "The Gospel According to St. John," p. lxxvi of the Introduction.

<sup>3</sup> "St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians," Sixth Edition, p. 363.

<sup>4</sup> "A Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament," Edition 1889, pp. 241-242.

<sup>5</sup> Cp. his treatise entitled "*Ἐλέγχον καὶ ἀνατροπὴς τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως*," (the more familiar title of which is, "*Contra Haereses*"), where he says, "*Εἰ γὰρ ἔδει ἀναφανδὸν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ κηρύττεσθαι τοῦτομα αὐτοῦ, δὲ ἐκείνου ἂν ἐβρέθη τοῦ καὶ τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν ἑωρακότος. Οὐδὲ γὰρ πρὸ πολλοῦ χρόνου ἑωράθη, ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας γενεᾶς, πρὸς τῷ τέλει τῆς Δομιτιανοῦ ἀρχῆς.*" Lib. V. 30, 3.

<sup>6</sup> The Irenaeian date (about 96 A. D.) is usually spoken of as the "*Late Date*" for the composition of the Apocalypse.

<sup>7</sup> Referred to in corollary 1.



led to very different opinions as to the *Authorship*<sup>1</sup> of the two writings. Thus besides Dionysius<sup>2</sup> of the third century A. D., the following writers, Schleiermacher, Credner, De Wette, Neander (David Mendel), Lücke, Bleek, Ewald and Düsterdieck, hold that the Apostle John wrote the Gospel, but not the Apocalypse; other writers, such as Köstlin, Zeller, Schwegler, Baur, Davidson and Hilgenfeld, maintain that the Apostle wrote the Apocalypse but not the Gospel.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Authorship of the Apocalypse is discussed at length by Bousset in "Die Offenbarung Johannis," SS. 33-51 and by Milligan in his "Discussions on the Apocalypse," pp. 148-179.

<sup>2</sup> Eusebius, "Eccl. Hist.," Lib. VII. 25.

<sup>3</sup> Still other writers, for a different reason, or reasons, such as Keim, Volkmar, Scholten, Lipsius, Harnack, Pfeiderer, Weizsäcker and Bousset, regard the Apostle John as the author of neither the Gospel nor the Apocalypse.\*

\* Cp., for example, Bousset, in "Die Offenbarung Johannis," SS. 33-51.

DATE DUE

~~AUG 21 1964~~

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.



BS2825 .8.L37  
The solecisms of the Apocalypse.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00029 1825